

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 23 MAR 2005

PCT

PCT

To:

AWAPATENT AB  
BOX 5117  
200 71 MALMÖ  
SVERIGE

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year)

21-03-2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference

21017377

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/SE2004/001906

International filing date (day/month/year)

16-12-2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

16-12-2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

G06K19/08

Applicant

ANOTO AB ET AL

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/SE  
Patent- och registreringsverket  
Box 5055  
S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88

Authorized officer

Pär Heimdal /LR

Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE2004/001906

Box No. 1 Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(h)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE2004/001906

Box No. II Priority

1. ☐ The following document has not yet been furnished:

☐ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

The priority claim from the Swedish national application SE 0303370-1 has been considered valid.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE2004/001906

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>2-11</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1, 12-14</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u></u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-14</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-14</u>	YES
	Claims	<u></u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

CITATIONS

The examination process has revealed the following documents:

D1: WO 0242989 A1  
D2: US 5852434 A1  
D3: US 6548768 B1  
D4: WO 0175783 A1

THE INVENTION

The present invention solves the problem of recording of a movement and, more specifically, to a method for recording a movement of a user unit over a base, which is provided with a position code. The recording of the movement may e.g. be carried out in order to electronically record handwritten information. The invention also relates to an apparatus, a computer program and a storage medium which can be used for recording a movement.

STATEMENT

Document D1, which is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of the claimed invention, reveals a method, apparatus and computer program for recording a movement of a user unit over a base, which is provided with a position code, see abstract. The movement of a user unit (electronical pen) over a surface with a position coded pattern is detected and registered, see page 62, line 24-29. If the user unit according to D1 fails to interpret the position code at a certain position, the detected value is registered as unknown. The user unit continues to register new positions and allow the computing system to later

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE2004/001906

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.  
Continuation of: BOX V

interpolate the position from adjacent samples.

To determine an absolute position by interpolation using the absolute position from an adjacent sample is thus previously known from D1. Consequently, the invention according to claim 1 and 12-14 lacks novelty and inventive step.

The claimed invention differs from the cited document D1 mainly in that a different terminology is used. However, this difference is not considered to constitute an inventive step.

In view of what is known from document D1 it is not considered to require any inventive work by a person skilled in the art to provide an apparatus as described in dependent claims 2-11. Accordingly, the invention claimed in claims 2-11 is not considered to involve an inventive step.

Document D2 reveals a method, apparatus and computer program for recording a movement of a user unit over a base, which is provided with a position code, see abstract. It is concluded that interpolation, extrapolation and triangulation are well known techniques to calculate the position of a user device on a surface with a position coding pattern, see column 5, line 41-46.

Thus also D2 seems to describe the invention according to claim 1 and 12-14, and an argumentation similar as the one used concerning D1 could be made.

Document D3 and D4 disclose the general state of the art, and are not considered to be of particular relevance.

CONCLUSION

The invention according to claims 1 and 12-14 lacks novelty.  
The invention according to claims 1-14 lacks inventive step.  
The invention is industrially applicable.